

**Meeting minutes
Governance Committee
Ontario, April 12, 2000**

I. Introduction

Members Present: Chuck Baucom, Ron Blaul, Jeff Eastman, Virginia Hastings, Leonard Inch, Dick Mayberry, Bill McCammon, Lou Meyer, Ray Navarro, Barbara Pletz, Gerald Simon,

Alternates present: David Nevins, Jan Ogar, Michael Osur, Kevin White.

EMSA staff present: Sheila Keller, Maureen McNeil, Miranda Swanson, Richard Watson, Claudia Zagrean.

II Approval of minutes:

Minutes were approved with no changes.

III. Business Items:

A. Update on requested legal opinion:

- The law firm of Mike Scarano declined to provide legal review of the mandated final authority concept. The reason invoked was conflict of interest, since the firm conducts county business.
- Suggestion was made that legal review be obtained from other parties interested in the concept, such as county and city attorneys.
- It was suggested that the group contact AG for a legal opinion.
- It was suggested that Mike Hammang, Deputy A.G. be asked for to provide legal review.
- The committee needs to decide how to move forward to get legal review of the shared governance concept.
- Funding for legal advice can be added to the Vision budget next year.

B. Discussion of organizational opinions on the mandated final authority concept and the Commission model:

Letters from CSAC and EMSAAC addressing the shared governance concept were handed out and reviewed. The question was raised whether or not the counties are in support of the shared governance concept. The issue was discussed and the following key points were made:

- The letter from CSAC does not clearly indicate support for the shared governance concept.
- Counties are supportive of the shared governance, mandated final authority concept but not supportive of the Commission model put forward by the Governance Committee.
- Counties are not trying to stop the process, but encourage the committee to seek other governing body models.
- It was stated that California Professional Fire Fighters Association is in support of the

- mandated final authority concept.
- Emergency Nurses' Association supports the mandated final authority concept.
- It was suggested that multiple governing models should be developed and presented to the organizations. It is difficult for all organizations to give approval for a particular governing body as regional differences exist.
- It was emphasized that the purpose of the group is not brainstorming or negotiating. The group cannot answer elected officials policy issues. The purpose of the group is to design a model, working within the system and submit it for review to all the stakeholders. The Governance Committee does not want to operate in a vacuum, as it moves forward towards a product.
- It was emphasized that committee members be committed to representing their organizations' opinions and not personal opinions, so that the final product may be approved when presented to the organizations.
- The Governance Committee acknowledges that the final product might not move through unchanged.

Expressed concerns regarding the Commission model:

Opinion was expressed that misconceptions might exist regarding the Commission model. The following concerns were expressed by the Counties regarding the Commission model:

- Shared governance body has to be composed of elected officials, with accountability to the public. Some members felt that CSAC and AG will not support a governance model unless it is made up of elected officials.
- A body composed of elected officials does not eliminate shared governance.
- It was pointed out that a request for an elected governing body remains an opinion unless there is a point of law providing statutory authority for this mandate.
- Committee should look at examples of governing bodies where the appointee is selected by an elected official, thus accountability to the public still exists.
- One of the difficulties CSAC has in supporting the Commission model is the financial obligation. Still need to address financial piece and appointment of representatives to Commission.
- Further clarification is needed on the issues that the governing body should have mandated final authority over.
- It was suggested that letters be requested from the organizations stating support of the shared governance body, elected or otherwise, if such a body could work. The letters should also identify areas of concern for each organization.
- A facilitator for the group might be employed at a later time, if needed.

Motion #1

Moved (Meyer), seconded and passed that a group comprised of Ron Blaul, Richard Watson, Bill McCammon and Lou Meyer visit Steve Perez, President, the Executive Director and any other principals CSAC desires, to solicit written support for shared governance with mandated final authority process.

C. Action Items:

1. Steve Perez with CSAC will be contacted to identify areas of concern, as stated in the motion above. Committee agreed to postpone legal review of the shared governance concept until there is a response from CSAC.
2. Richard Watson, Lou Meyer and Ron Blaul will have a conference call to discuss how the question should be presented to EMSAC.
3. Lou Meyer will formalize question for review and Richard Watson will request an opinion from the A.G.

IV Future items:

- Focus groups will meet prior to the next committee meeting.
- Subgroup # 3 will meet April 27, 2000 to further refine the Commission model. Miranda Swanson and Richard Watson be attending the meeting.
- **Next Governance committee meeting will take place June 22, 2000 from 10:00AM to 4:00PM, at EMSA, 1930 9th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.**